

## Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-D200-2

Short Proposal Title: Cosumnes/Mokelumne acquisition

**1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, the exposition of the hypotheses and relationship to the study site are well developed in this proposal; all of which are contingent on the global hypothesis that restoration of more natural flooding and sediment transport regimes will result in restoration of associated habitat components and ecosystem processes. What impresses me at the outset is the applicant's identification of measurable response parameters embedded in the objectives and hypotheses -- sediment deposition, seedling recruitment, sandbar formation, groundwater recharge. The applicant states these in the form of questions which are dispositive in guiding management decisions. I am particularly interested in the success that this sort of project may have in ameliorating groundwater imbalance

**1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, it does. The applicant relates floodwater function to a series of benefits related to the idea that such flooding will promote habitat restoration.

**1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

The applicant explains that the acquisition is the first phase -- that detailed studies would be conducted later -- but that baseline monitoring will be immediately implemented through expansion of an ongoing conservation program.

**1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, the applicant outlines the criteria upon which the acquisitions were targeted: prior studies, use by cranes, and evaluation potential. Inspection of Map 2 reveals that the target areas are key areas within which the Consumnes (or its confluence with the Mokelumne) River corridor under preservation are currently very narrow. These are very logical choices, and very important additions to the overall preserve.

**1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes, as the proposal notes, there are many severe stressors on the natural function of riparian corridors, impacts that can be offset by landscape level efforts. It is undeniable that such efforts will encounter scrutiny owing to the re-dedication of land uses from agriculture or grazing to native habitat -- and in particular -- whether those habitat goals are being met. The applicant clearly outlines the goals in terms of habitat and species population support, and the stressors. The proposal identifies key hypotheses in terms of benefit to water supply, flood control, habitat, and education.

**2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No, there is no specific monitoring plan in this proposal; the applicant notes that baseline monitoring would be accomplished through expansion of current preserve monitoring. This current monitoring is not described, but the applicant does indicate that some bird monitoring for this project would be done by the Point Reyes Bird Observatory. Some discussion of following the progression of habitat development with experimental breaching, and using hydrologic models is provided under the start-up stewardship section.

**2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

To the extent that this proposal concentrates on land acquisition, it does include mention of the documentation involved in such acquisition and where it would be archived.

**3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Judging from the width of the current corridor, it would seem most impractical without funding this proposal. Whether it is actually sufficient in scale to test the hypotheses (or is more than needed); I cannot say.

**4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?**

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

I am most impressed by the TNC's accomplishments as an agency, both locally and nationally. However, the proposal doesn't specify the principals or their background. Judging by their success, it is highly likely they are qualified to conduct the acquisition.

**Miscellaneous comments**

**Overall Evaluation  
Summary Rating**

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Poor

**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Summary rating explanation: (Very Good). This proposal request is to provide key additions which would fill in key gaps within the Cosumnes-Mokelumne preserve area -- additions which are necessary to test important hypotheses pertaining to the ability of flooding regime to maintain and restore habitat, support sensitive species populations, and provide ancillary benefits through flood control, groundwater recharge, and education. It is a lean proposal -- 90% of the budget to land acquisition, with the remainder being a modicum of support for monitoring, overhead, and other costs. The applicant has a history of successes in the arena of restoration, with this area being one of the most prominent and visible in the CALFED area of consideration. I strongly recommend funding this proposal in its entirety.